

1

2

3

4

5

Q

7

[illegible]
$$\begin{pmatrix} \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{pmatrix}$$

9

Q

1

3

1 By letter dated February 23, 2000, Appellant appealed to the Director of the Department of
2 Personnel (DOP). In his letter of appeal, Appellant requested that his position be reallocated to the
3 Information Technology System Specialist (ITSS) 4 classification.

4
5 On June 13, 2000, the DOP Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted an allocation review of
6 Appellant's position. By letter dated July 14, 2000, Mr. Peterson determined that Appellant's
7 position was properly allocated to the ITSS 3 classification. On August 11, 2000, Appellant
8 appealed the Director's determination to the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions to
9 the Director's determination are the subject of this proceeding.

10
11 Appellant is the designated subject matter specialist for the TAXIS system. Appellant performs at a
12 professional level in both the applications and system fields and is responsible for providing
13 consultation to a large, statewide work group. Appellant is responsible for multiple, complex
14 applications that cross more than one division of the agency.

15
16 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that prior to the class study, he should
17 have been classified as a Program Coordinator (PC) 3 rather than a PC 2 and that prior to his
18 reallocation to the Information Technology System Specialist (ITSS) 3 classification, he was
19 actually performing Computer Information Consultant 3 responsibilities. Appellant asserts that if
20 he had been properly allocated at the time of the class study, his position would have transitioned
21 into the Information Technology Applications Specialist 4 or the ITSS 4 classification. Appellant
22 contends that he provides support for multiple, cross-system business functions, not just for the
23 TAXIS system, that he performs at the senior professional level, and that he is the primary system
24 and database consultant for the TAXIS program. Therefore, Appellant asserts that his position
25 should be allocated to the ITSS 4 classification.

1 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that Appellant's second-line supervisor
2 and the agency's subject matter experts agreed that Appellant was not performing at the ITSS 4
3 level. Respondent contends that Appellant "walks the line" between applications and system
4 responsibility, that he is responsible for a moderate-sized system, and that the system is not high
5 risk or high profile. Respondent further contends that Appellant works in a business unit, not an
6 information technology unit, and that the focus of his position is to work with people and users of
7 the system. Respondent argues that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the ITSS 3
8 classification.

9
10 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position was properly
11 allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist 3 classification should be affirmed.

12
13 **Relevant Classifications.** Information Technology Systems Specialist 3, class code 03273, and
14 Information Technology Systems Specialist 4, class code 03274.

15
16 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
17 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
18 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
19 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
20 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
21 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
22 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
23 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

24
25 Position allocations are "based upon an investigation of duties and responsibilities assigned and/or
26 performed and other information and recommendations." (WAC 356-20-200). Because a current

1 and accurate description of a position's duties and responsibilities is documented in an approved
2 classification questionnaire, the classification questionnaire becomes the basis for allocation of a
3 position. An allocation determination must be based on the overall duties and responsibilities, as
4 documented in the CQ. Jacobson v. Dept of Ecology, PAB No. ALLO 99-0004 (2000).

5
6 Appellant's CQ indicates that his position is designated the senior professional level responsible for
7 the primary system and database consulting for Unemployment Insurance TAXIS, Wage, Tax
8 Employer's Help Line and Data Warehouse. Appellant provides technical support to the
9 Information Technical Services Department (ITSD) staff and provides support, consultation and
10 training on the TAXIS Main Frame PC application to staff throughout the state. Appellant analyses
11 and develops computer applications and evaluates the business needs in conjunction with other
12 ITSD senior and technical staff. Appellant's supervisor agreed with the description of duties in
13 Appellant's CQ. Although his second-line supervisor indicated that he disagreed with the CQ, he
14 failed to provide any meaningful rationale for his disagreement.

15
16 At the ITSS 3 level, incumbents are journey-level professionals who are independently responsible
17 for projects and troubleshooting and resolving problems within their assigned areas. Incumbents
18 are responsible for moderate-size, moderate-risk projects that impact a single work group or single
19 business function. Incumbents may serve as technical mentors to others.

20
21 Appellant's position is described by the ITSS 3 classification. However, the scope of his duties and
22 the breadth of his responsibilities go beyond those encompassed by the 3 level.

23
24 At the ITSS 4 level, incumbents are senior professional-level specialists responsible for complex
25 systems, projects or operational problems that have a broad impact. Incumbents at this level utilize
26 discretion and independent evaluation to determine how to approach a problem and meet complex

1 systems needs. Incumbents are assigned projects that impact multiple units and functions, integrate
2 new technology and change how business is done. Incumbents at this level serve as a technical
3 mentor and coach to others.

4
5 Appellant performs senior professional level duties and is responsible for multiple, complex, cross-
6 divisional applications with broad statewide impact. Appellant's position is best described at the
7 ITSS 4 level.

8
9 **Conclusion.** Appellant's appeal on exceptions should be granted and his position should be
10 reallocated to the ITSS 4 classification. The determination of the Director, dated July 14, 2000,
11 should be reversed.

12
13 **ORDER**

14 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of Hao Duong is granted, the
15 determination of the Director, dated July 14, 2000, is reversed, and Appellant's position is
16 reallocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist 4 classification.

17
18 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2001.

19
20 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

21 _____
22 Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

23 _____
24 Leana D. Lamb, Member

25
26
Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504